



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL501540-DR-26

Development	The works include the conversion of the attic into habitable accommodation with a flat roof dormer to the rear, pitched roof dormers to the sides, and a attic level street facing balcony to the front of the property, including all associated site works
Location	1 Silchester Downs, Glenageary, Co. Dublin, A96 C3V6
Planning Authority	Dun Laoighre Rathdown County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	D26B/0177/WEB
Applicant(s)	Jennifer Ryan
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission with conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Alan Hickey Emma Williams Kevin McKenna Orlaith O'Loughlin Niall and Ashley Hughes

Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	13 th August 2026
Inspector	Andrew Hersey

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1 The appeal site is located at No. 1 Silchester Downs, Glenageary, Co. Dublin and has a stated area of approximately 0.069 hectares. The site accommodates a relatively large two-storey detached dwelling situated within Silchester Downs, a small established residential development of five detached dwellings of varying architectural styles.
- 1.2 The dwelling is positioned on a short private cul-de-sac and is set within a relatively generous plot. The site includes a large paved parking area to the front/northeast, garden areas to the side and a substantial rear garden, which is enclosed by mature hedging and other vegetation. The submitted plans indicate a rear garden area of approximately 244 sq.m.
- 1.3 The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character. The properties within Silchester Downs are relatively closely arranged around the cul-de-sac, while larger established detached properties are located to the rear and southeast, fronting Silchester Road. The immediate residential context is characterised by two-storey detached dwellings with pitched and hipped roof forms and mature boundary treatment.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1 Permission is sought for alterations to the existing dwelling comprising the conversion of the attic to habitable accommodation. The works include a flat-roofed dormer to the rear, pitched-roof dormers to the side elevations and a street-facing balcony at attic level to the front of the property, together with associated site works.
- 2.2 The proposed attic accommodation comprises a bedroom, ensuite and lounge area served by the proposed dormers and rooflights, with access to an approximately 9

sq.m balcony to the front. The submitted drawings indicate that the works would increase the stated floor area of the dwelling from approximately 240 sq.m to 290 sq.m.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1 Decision – Grant Permission subject to the following conditions. The following conditions are relevant to the appeal;

- Condition 2 requires the rear/southeast dormer window to be substantially reduced in height. The revised window is to have a maximum top-to-bottom height of 0.75m and a minimum sill height of 1.65m above finished floor level. The stated reason is to protect residential amenity.
- Condition 3 requires the glazing to the ensuite windows in the southwest side roof extension to be manufactured opaque or frosted glass and permanently maintained as such; applied film is specifically excluded. Again, the reason is residential amenity
- No S48 Development Contribution condition is applied

3.2 Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1 The Case Planner considered the principle of the proposed attic conversion and roof alterations to be acceptable having regard to the Objective 'A' zoning of the site. The assessment focused primarily on the scale and design of the proposed roof alterations and their potential impact on the visual and residential amenities of adjoining properties.

3.2.2 The rear dormer and proposed alterations to the side roof slopes were considered acceptable in terms of their overall scale and design. Potential overlooking from the rear dormer was considered capable of being addressed by reducing the height of the bedroom window and raising its sill level, while the southwest-facing ensuite windows were required to be obscure glazed. The proposed front dormer and inset balcony were also considered acceptable having regard to their integration within

the roof form, the scale of the existing dwelling and the separation from adjoining properties.

- 3.2.3 Overall, the Case Planner concluded that, subject to conditions, the development would not have a significant adverse impact on the character of the dwelling or streetscape, or on the residential amenities and privacy of surrounding properties. Permission was therefore recommended

3.3 Other Technical Reports

- 3.3.1 None on file

3.4 Prescribed Bodies

- 3.4.1 None on file

3.5 Third Party Submissions

- 3.5.1 Emma Williams, Rosenberg, Silchester Road – Raises concerns regarding overdevelopment, the scale and visual prominence of the proposed dormers and balcony, inadequate separation distances and potential overlooking and overshadowing of the dwelling and private amenity space. The proposal is also considered out of character with Silchester Downs.
- 3.5.2 Orlaith O'Loughlin, Linden, Silchester Road – Raises concerns regarding the scale and design of the roof extensions and their potential to overlook and overshadow the dwelling, rear garden and patio area, together with impacts on outlook and visual amenity.
- 3.5.3 Kevin McKenna, No. 5 Silchester Downs – Considers the proposal to constitute overdevelopment and to be visually intrusive and out of character. Particular concerns relate to the front balcony and side dormers and their potential to overlook and dominate the dwelling, front garden and driveway.
- 3.5.4 Niall and Ashley Hughes, No. 2 Silchester Downs – Raise concerns regarding the scale and visual impact of the roof extensions, inadequate separation distances and

impacts on privacy and private open space. Particular concern relates to overlooking and overshadowing of the rear garden and patio from the proposed northeastern dormer.

- 3.5.5 A. Hickey, Ashdoonan, 32 Silchester Road – Raises particular concern regarding the proposed front balcony, which it is contended would directly overlook the rear garden and conservatory at No. 32 Silchester Road. The submission disputes the applicant's assertion that the balcony would face only the public street and also notes the absence of comparable balconies within Silchester Downs. Removal of the balcony and alterations to the associated windows are sought.

4.0 Planning History

4.1 On Site

- Planning Reg. Ref. D26B/0162/WEB – An earlier application by the same applicant for the same development as that currently under appeal. The application was deemed invalid

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Development Plan

- 5.1.1 The development plan in force in the area is the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022–2028. Within the plan, the appeal site is zoned Objective A, which seeks *'to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities'*. Residential development, including extensions to existing dwellings, is permitted in principle under this zoning objective.

- 5.1.2 The following provisions of the Development Plan are of particular relevance:

- Policy Objective PHP19 – Existing Housing Stock – Adaptation, which supports the adaptation of existing housing stock to meet changing household needs.

- Policy Objective PHP20 – Protection of Existing Residential Amenity, which seeks to ensure that new development has regard to the residential amenities of existing properties.
- Section 12.3.7 – Additional Accommodation in Existing Built-up Areas.
- Section 12.3.7.1(iv) – Alterations at Roof/Attic Level, which provides the relevant development management guidance for dormer extensions and other alterations at roof level.
- Section 12.8.7 – Private Amenity Space – Quality Standards, including the provisions relating to separation distances and residential amenity.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (Site Code 004024) which is located 2.5km metres to the north east of the site and
- South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210) which is located 2.5km to the north east of the site
- Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (Site Code 003000) which is located 2km to the east of the site
- Dalkey Islands SPA (Site Code 004172) which is located 2.2km to the east of the site

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1 The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning & Development Regulations 2001, as amended. No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

7.0 The Appeal

- 7.1 Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1 Five third-party appeals have been lodged against the Planning Authority's decision to grant permission. The appeals were submitted by Alan Hickey of Ashdoonan, 32 Silchester Road; Emma Williams of Rosenberg, 31 Silchester Road; Orlaith O'Loughlin of Linden, Silchester Road; Kevin McKenna of 5 Silchester Downs; and Niall and Ashley Hughes of 2 Silchester Downs.

7.1.2 An appeal was lodged by Alan Hickey, Ashdoonan, 32 Silchester Road, on 16th June 2026. The principal grounds of appeal may be summarised as follows:

- The proposal represents an excessive alteration of the existing dwelling and is inconsistent with the established character and scale of development within Silchester Downs.
- The proposed attic-level balcony would result in overlooking of the appellant's property and private garden and consequent loss of privacy.
- The extent of the roof alterations, including the dormers, balcony and associated glazing, would give rise to an overbearing and visually intrusive form of development.
- The proposal would adversely affect the architectural character of the area and is stated to be inconsistent with relevant provisions of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan, including those relating to residential amenity and extensions to dwellings.
- Concerns are raised regarding the adequacy of the submitted drawings and supporting information, including the representation of ground levels, sightlines and the relationship with neighbouring properties.
- The appeal raises concerns regarding construction impacts and the potential effect of the development on residential amenity and property values.
- It is requested that permission be refused or, alternatively, that the proposal be substantially revised, including the omission of the attic-level balcony. The appeal document identifies the balcony as a particular source of overlooking towards No. 32.

7.1.3 An appeal was lodged by Emma Williams, Rosenberg, 31 Silchester Road, on 16th June 2026. The grounds relate principally to the scale and visual impact of the

proposed roof alterations and their relationship with Rosenberg. The appellant contends that the proposed southwest-facing pitched-roof dormer would be located approximately 2.5 metres from the common boundary and that, notwithstanding the requirement for obscure glazing to the ensuite windows under Condition No. 3, the development would remain visually obtrusive due to its proximity, scale and massing. Concerns are also raised regarding overlooking and overshadowing of the rear garden and patio, the visual impact of the metal-clad dormers and balcony, and the effect upon the character of the surrounding area. The appellant considers that an alternative design omitting the rear dormer and incorporating obscure glazing to the ensuite and lounge windows would be more acceptable. A substantial redesign or refusal of permission is sought.

7.1.4 An appeal was lodged by Orlaith O'Loughlin, Linden, Silchester Road, on 14th June 2026. It is contended that the proposed rear dormer would overlook and visually dominate the appellant's rear garden, patio and dwelling. Particular concern is raised regarding the separation between the proposed southeast-facing dormer and Linden, which the appeal states is approximately 12.2 metres between opposing windows. The appellant considers that the modification required by the Planning Authority to increase the sill height of the dormer window to 1.65 metres would not adequately address the wider effects of the dormer upon residential amenity. Concerns are also raised regarding potential overlooking from the proposed rooflights and the overall scale and design of the attic conversion. The appeal seeks a substantial redesign, including removal of the rear dormer, or refusal of permission.

7.1.5 An appeal was lodged by Kevin McKenna, 5 Silchester Downs, on 14th June 2026. The appellant considers that the proposed roof alterations constitute overdevelopment and would adversely affect the established character of Silchester Downs. Particular concern is raised regarding the proposed front balcony, which it is stated would directly overlook first-floor bedroom accommodation and the private garden at No. 5. The proposed dormer structures and extension of the existing roof ridge are also considered visually intrusive and overbearing when viewed from the appellant's property. The appeal contends that the cumulative extent of the roof alterations would materially alter the character of the existing dwelling and the wider development and seeks substantial redesign or refusal of permission.

7.1.6 An appeal was lodged by Niall and Ashley Hughes, 2 Silchester Downs, on 14th June 2026. The appellants contend that the proposed northeast-facing roof alterations, including the large gable window and dormer structures, would result in overlooking and visual intrusion affecting their dwelling, private garden and patio areas. The appeal refers to a separation distance of approximately 11 metres between the proposed pitched-roof dormer/gable and No. 2 and considers that the scale of the proposed gable window and dormers would result in an unacceptable impact notwithstanding this separation. Concerns are also raised regarding the cumulative visual impact of the roof alterations, the metal-clad dormers and balcony and their effect on the established character of Silchester Downs. A substantial redesign or refusal of permission is sought.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

7.3.1 A response to the appeal was received from Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Council on 12th June 2026. The Planning Authority states that the grounds of appeal do not raise any new issues that would warrant a change in its assessment of the proposed development.

7.4. First Party Response to Appeal

7.4.1 A response to the five third-party appeals was submitted by the applicant, Jennifer Ryan. The response supports the Planning Authority's decision to grant permission and accepts the conditions attached thereto. It is submitted that the matters raised in the appeals were adequately considered by the Planning Authority and do not warrant a different decision by the Commission.

7.4.2 The principal points raised in the first party response may be summarised as follows:

- The proposed development comprises an attic conversion and associated roof alterations to an existing dwelling and would not increase the overall height of the house. The works are considered appropriate in principle having regard to the residential zoning of the site and the provisions of the Dún-Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022–2028 relating to alterations at roof and attic level.

- The applicant disputes the contention that the proposal constitutes overdevelopment. It is submitted that the dormers and balcony have been designed as part of the existing roof form and would not read as an additional storey or result in an overbearing form of development.
- The appeal site is outside, but immediately adjoining, the Silchester Road Architectural Conservation Area. It is submitted that the proposed alterations would not be readily visible from Silchester Road and would not adversely affect the character or setting of the ACA.
- With regard to the proposed front balcony, it is submitted that this element is integrated into the roof form and would largely read as a dormer when viewed from surrounding properties. The balcony is orientated principally towards the cul-de-sac and the applicant disputes that it would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.
- In response to the appeal from No. 32 Silchester Road, the first party refers to separation distances of approximately 19.96 metres between the front elevation of No. 1 and the boundary of No. 32 and approximately 39 metres between the proposed balcony and the appellant's property. It is submitted that existing walls and mature planting provide additional screening and that no material overlooking would arise.
- In relation to No. 5 Silchester Downs, it is stated that the proposed front dormer and balcony would be approximately 32 metres from the part-gabled elevation of that dwelling and would not result in a material loss of privacy or residential amenity.
- With regard to the appeal from Linden, the first party disputes the separation distances advanced in the appeal and states that there would be approximately 18 metres between the rear dormer and the nearest first-floor window facing No. 1. Reference is made to the 16-metre separation standard contained in SPPR 1 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines. It is also submitted that Condition No. 2, requiring the rear dormer window to have a minimum sill height of 1.65 metres, would satisfactorily address overlooking.
- In relation to the appeal from Rosenberg, it is submitted that the southwest-facing dormer would remain contained within the overall roof form and would not be

overbearing or visually obtrusive. The applicant accepts Condition No. 3 requiring the ensuite windows to be permanently fitted with opaque/frosted glazing.

- With regard to No. 2 Silchester Downs, it is submitted that the side dormer is orientated towards the front of that property rather than its principal private amenity space and, having regard to the stated separation distance and existing boundary treatment, would not result in a material diminution of residential amenity.
- The response disputes the appellants' concerns regarding overshadowing and loss of sunlight and considers that the scale, position and orientation of the proposed roof alterations, together with existing separation distances and boundary screening, are such that no significant adverse impact would arise.
- The first party further submits that the absence of similar balconies within Silchester Downs does not establish an unacceptable precedent and that concerns relating to depreciation of property values do not provide a basis for refusal in the absence of a material adverse impact on residential amenity.

7.4.3 The first party concludes that the proposed development would be consistent with the relevant provisions of the County Development Plan, would not adversely affect the character or setting of the adjoining ACA and would not result in an unacceptable diminution of the residential amenities of adjoining properties. The Commission is therefore requested to dismiss the appeals and uphold the Planning Authority's decision to grant permission subject to conditions.

7.5 Observations

7.5.1 None received

8.0 Assessment

8.1 I have examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the five third-party appeals, the first-party response, the Planning Authority's assessment and decision, and having regard to the relevant provisions of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022–2028 and the Sustainable

Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024), I consider that the substantive issues arising in this appeal can be addressed under the following headings:

- Principle of Development
- Design, Scale and Visual Impact
- Residential Amenity – Overlooking and Privacy
- Overshadowing and Overbearing Impact
- Architectural Conservation Area
- Other Matters

8.2 Principle of Development

8.2.1 The appeal site is zoned Objective ‘A’ under the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022–2028, the objective for which is “to provide residential development and improve residential amenity while protecting the existing residential amenities”. The proposed development comprises alterations to an existing dwelling to facilitate the conversion of the attic to habitable accommodation. The principle of extending and adapting an existing dwelling is therefore acceptable at this location, subject to the protection of the residential and visual amenities of the area.

8.2.2 Section 12.3.7.1(iv) of the Development Plan specifically addresses alterations at roof/attic level and provides for such works where they have regard to the character and size of the structure, its position on the streetscape and proximity to adjoining structures. I also note Policy Objective PHP19, which supports the adaptation of the existing housing stock, and Policy Objective PHP20 concerning the protection of existing residential amenity.

8.2.3 I do not consider that the creation of additional habitable accommodation within the roofscape of this relatively substantial detached dwelling represents overdevelopment in principle. The principal issue is therefore not the acceptability of an attic conversion itself, but whether the particular form of roof alterations proposed, including the dormers and front balcony, can be accommodated without

unacceptable impacts on the character of the dwelling or the amenities of adjoining properties.

8.3 Design, Scale and Visual Impact

- 8.3.1 The appeals raise concerns that the cumulative extent of alterations to the roof would materially change the character of the dwelling and result in an overly dominant and visually intrusive third-storey form. Particular concerns relate to the flat-roofed rear dormer, the pitched-roof side dormers and the front dormer and balcony.
- 8.3.2 Section 12.3.7.1 of the Development Plan provides guidance in relation to extensions and alterations to dwellings, including dormer extensions. In assessing such proposals, regard is required to be had to their scale, design and relationship with the existing dwelling, together with their potential impact upon the character of the dwelling and surrounding area and upon the amenities of adjoining properties.
- 8.3.3 I acknowledge that the proposal involves alterations to each of the principal roof slopes and would result in a noticeable change to the appearance of the dwelling. However, the overall ridge height of the dwelling would remain unchanged and the additional accommodation would remain substantially contained within the existing roof profile. The dormer elements would therefore read as alterations to the existing roof form rather than as a separate additional storey.
- 8.3.4 Silchester Downs comprises a small group of detached dwellings which, while sharing a general architectural character, are not entirely uniform in their design. The appeal dwelling is also of substantial scale and occupies a relatively generous and irregularly shaped site. In this context, and having regard to the criteria set out under Section 12.3.7.1 of the Development Plan, I do not consider that the proposed dormers or other roof alterations would result in a building of excessive scale relative to the existing dwelling or would unduly detract from the established character of the cul-de-sac.
- 8.3.5 The proposed front balcony is recessed within the roof form rather than projecting from the building. While it would introduce an architectural feature which is not characteristic of the other dwellings within Silchester Downs, I do not consider that

the absence of comparable balconies within the cul-de-sac is, of itself, sufficient reason to refuse permission.

8.3.6 I note that the separation distances associated with the proposed development are considered elsewhere in this assessment having regard to the relevant Specific Planning Policy Requirement (SPPR). For completeness, I note that [the Development Plan does not contain an equivalent separation-distance requirement. Accordingly, the assessment of separation distance should be read having regard to the applicable national planning policy and the status afforded to the relevant SPPR.

8.3.7 I have also had regard to Condition No. 2 attached by the Planning Authority. I consider that the requirements of this condition remain necessary in order to ensure that the detailed form and external appearance of the proposed roof alterations are satisfactorily integrated with the existing dwelling and that the development does not give rise to an unacceptable visual impact. In the event of a grant of permission by the Commission, I therefore recommend that Condition No. 2, or a condition of equivalent effect, be attached.

8.3.8 Having regard to the scale of the existing dwelling, the retention of the principal ridge and eaves lines, the positioning of the proposed accommodation largely within the existing roof envelope, and the provisions of Section 12.3.7.1 of the Development Plan, I am satisfied that the development would not materially detract from the character of the dwelling or the established character of Silchester Downs. Subject to the attachment of the condition referred to above, I consider the proposed development acceptable in terms of design, scale and visual impact

8.4 Residential Amenity – Overlooking and Privacy

8.4.1 Overlooking and loss of privacy are significant issues raised throughout the five appeals. Given the configuration of the appeal site and the number of adjoining residential properties, I consider it appropriate to assess the relationship with each of the potentially affected properties separately.

8.4.2 In considering separation distances, I have had regard to SPPR 1 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024). The Guidelines provide a more flexible approach to separation

distances than the traditional application of a 22-metre standard and provide that a minimum separation distance of 16 metres should generally be maintained between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses above ground-floor level. The Guidelines do not prescribe a minimum separation distance to the front of houses.

- 8.4.3 The 16-metre separation should not, however, be applied as an isolated numerical test in the circumstances of this appeal. The orientation of windows, difference in levels, nature of the rooms served, existing boundary treatment and whether views would be direct or oblique are also relevant considerations.

Linden – Orlaith O'Loughlin

- 8.4.4 The appeal from Orlaith O'Loughlin, Linden, raises particular concern regarding the proposed rear/southeast dormer serving the attic bedroom. The appellant contends that there is approximately 12.2 metres between opposing windows, while the first party identifies a separation of approximately 18 metres between the proposed dormer and the nearest first-floor window facing the appeal site.

- 8.4.5 The Planning Authority specifically addressed the potential for overlooking from the rear dormer through Condition No. 2, which requires the bedroom window to be reduced to a maximum height of 0.75 metres and its sill raised to at least 1.65 metres above finished floor level. The effect would be to provide a high-level opening rather than a conventional window affording direct views towards Linden. I note that the applicant has accepted this requirement.

- 8.4.6 Having regard to the relationship between the properties and subject to the requirements of Condition No. 2, I am satisfied that the rear dormer would not result in significant direct overlooking of either the dwelling or principal private amenity space at Linden.

Rosenberg – Emma Williams

- 8.4.7 The appeal from Emma Williams, Rosenberg, raises concerns regarding the southwest-facing roof extension, including its proximity to the common boundary and its potential impact on privacy. The appellant refers to a separation of approximately 2.5 metres between the proposed roof extension and the boundary.

8.4.8 The proposed windows on this elevation would serve an ensuite and would therefore not constitute opposing habitable-room windows of the type addressed by SPPR 1. Furthermore, Condition No. 3 of the Planning Authority's decision requires these windows to comprise permanently maintained manufactured opaque or frosted glazing.

8.4.9 Subject to the retention of this condition, I am satisfied that these windows would not give rise to direct overlooking or an unacceptable loss of privacy at Rosenberg.

No. 2 Silchester Downs – Niall and Ashley Hughes

8.4.10 The appeal from Niall and Ashley Hughes, No. 2 Silchester Downs, raises concerns regarding the northeast-facing dormer/gable and its potential to overlook their dwelling, rear garden and patio. The appeal refers to a separation of approximately 11 metres.

8.4.11 Having regard to the orientation of this roof element, its relationship with No. 2 and the established boundary treatment, I consider that the opportunity for direct overlooking of the principal private amenity area associated with No. 2 would be limited. The relationship is also materially different from one involving directly opposing rear-facing habitable-room windows.

8.4.12 I am therefore not satisfied that this element of the proposal would result in an undue loss of privacy sufficient to warrant refusal or substantial modification of the development.

No. 5 Silchester Downs – Kevin McKenna

8.4.13 The appeal from Kevin McKenna, No. 5 Silchester Downs, raises particular concern regarding overlooking from the proposed front dormer and balcony towards the dwelling, including first-floor bedrooms and garden areas. The first-party response indicates a separation of approximately 32 metres between the proposed balcony/front dormer and the relevant part of No. 5.

8.4.14 As noted above, SPPR 1 does not prescribe a minimum separation distance between the fronts of houses. In this instance, having regard to the substantial separation involved, the orientation of the balcony towards the cul-de-sac and its recessed position within the roof, I do not consider that the proposal would result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking or loss of privacy at No. 5.

No. 32 Silchester Road – A. Hickey

8.4.15 The appeal from A. Hickey, No. 32 Silchester Road, focuses particularly on the proposed front balcony and disputes the assertion that the balcony would overlook the street only. The appellant identifies the potential for views towards the rear garden and conservatory at No. 32.

8.4.16 I accept that views from the proposed balcony would not be confined exclusively to the roadway and that some views towards the grounds of No. 32 would be possible. However, the first-party response identifies a distance of approximately 39 metres between the proposed balcony and the dwelling at No. 32, with the nearer boundary stated to be approximately 19.96 metres from the front elevation of the appeal dwelling. The intervening area also contains established boundary walls and vegetation.

8.4.17 Having regard to these substantial separation distances, the recessed nature of the balcony and the intervening boundary treatment, I consider that any views towards the garden of No. 32 would be relatively distant and oblique. I do not consider that they would constitute such an intrusive loss of privacy as to warrant either the omission of the balcony or refusal of permission.

8.4.18 Having considered each of the individual relationships with the adjoining properties, I am satisfied that, subject to Conditions Nos. 2 and 3 imposed by the Planning Authority, the proposed development would not result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking or loss of privacy.

8.5 Overshadowing and Overbearing Impact

8.5.1 The appeals also raise concerns regarding overshadowing, loss of sunlight and an overbearing impact, particularly in relation to Linden, Rosenberg and Nos. 2 and 5 Silchester Downs.

8.5.2 The proposed development does not increase the principal ridge height of the dwelling and the works are concentrated at roof level. While the dormers would increase the built form of the roof and would be visible from adjoining properties, their positioning within and behind the existing eaves and roof profile is relevant.

8.5.3 In relation to Linden (Orlaith O'Loughlin), concerns are raised regarding the potential for the rear dormer to result in overshadowing and an overbearing impact on the

dwelling and rear garden. Having regard to the height and scale of the proposed dormer, its orientation and separation from the neighbouring property, together with the fact that the overall ridge height of the dwelling would remain unchanged, I do not consider that the proposal would result in a material loss of daylight or sunlight or an unacceptable overbearing impact on Linden.

8.5.4 In relation to Rosenberg (Emma Williams), the southwest roof extension would be closer to the common boundary. However, it remains a roof-level intervention to an existing dwelling and would not increase the overall ridge height. I do not consider that its scale or positioning would result in such visual enclosure or overshadowing as to seriously injure the residential amenities of Rosenberg.

8.5.5 Similarly, in relation to No. 2 Silchester Downs (Niall and Ashley Hughes) and No. 5 Silchester Downs (Kevin McKenna), the separation distances and orientation of the proposed roof alterations are such that I do not consider that a significant loss of daylight or sunlight would arise.

8.5.6 On balance, while the proposed roof alterations would be visible from a number of adjoining properties, I do not consider that visibility in itself constitutes an overbearing impact. I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in unacceptable overshadowing or loss of daylight or sunlight to adjoining residential properties.

8.6 Architectural Conservation Area

8.6.1 The appeal site itself is outside, but immediately adjoins, the Silchester Road Architectural Conservation Area, the boundary of which runs along the southwestern boundary of the site. Rosenberg, No. 31 Silchester Road, lies within the ACA.

8.6.2 The potential impact of the proposal upon the character and setting of the ACA is therefore a relevant consideration. I note, however, that the appeal dwelling is located within Silchester Downs and that the proposed works are primarily experienced within the context of this cul-de-sac rather than from Silchester Road.

8.6.3 Having regard to the position of the appeal dwelling, the intervening development and vegetation and the nature and scale of the roof alterations, I do not consider that the proposal would materially detract from the character or setting of the adjoining ACA.

8.7 Other Matters

8.7.1 Issues relating to property values and the potential effect of the development upon views have also been raised. While I acknowledge these concerns, there is no established entitlement to the preservation of a private view across adjoining property. Having regard to my assessment above, I am also not satisfied that the development would result in such a diminution of residential amenity as would provide a substantive planning basis for refusal on grounds relating to property values.

8.7.2 Concerns regarding the adequacy of the submitted drawings and the absence of consultation with adjoining residents have also been raised. I am satisfied that sufficient information has been submitted to allow the proposed development and its relationship with adjoining properties to be properly assessed. There is no statutory requirement for an applicant to undertake prior consultation with adjoining property owners in respect of a development of this nature.

8.8 Conclusion

8.8.1 Having regard to the Objective 'A' zoning of the site, the provisions of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022–2028, the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024), the scale and character of the existing dwelling and the pattern of surrounding development, I consider the principle of the proposed attic conversion and associated roof alterations to be acceptable.

8.8.2 I have considered the individual relationships between the proposed development and Linden (Orlaith O'Loughlin), Rosenberg (Emma Williams), No. 2 Silchester Downs (Niall and Ashley Hughes), No. 5 Silchester Downs (Kevin McKenna) and Ashdoonan, No. 32 Silchester Road (A. Hickey). Having regard to the scale and nature of the proposed roof alterations, the orientation and separation of the surrounding properties and the measures required by condition to protect privacy, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, overshadowing, loss of privacy or overbearing impact on adjoining residential properties.

8.8.3 I therefore concur with the Planning Authority that the development is acceptable, subject to appropriate conditions, including the modification of the rear dormer

window and the use of permanently obscured glazing to the southwest-facing ensuite windows

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 9.2 The subject site is located
- 2.5km to the west of the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (Site Code 004024)
 - 2.5km to the east of the South Dublin Bay SAC (Site Code 000210)
 - 2.0km to the west of Rockabill to Dalkey Island SAC (Site Code 003000)
 - 2.2km to the west of Dalkey Islands SPA (Site Code 004172)
- 9.3 The proposed development comprises of the construction of extensions to an existing dwelling with ancillary site works. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.4 An Appropriate Assessment Screening Report submitted at Further Information stage concluded that there is no direct source-pathway-receptor linkage between the proposed development and the South Dublin Bay SAC or the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA and, accordingly, that likely significant effects on these European sites could be excluded. The Planning Authority's Biodiversity Officer considered the Screening Report to be adequate and to provide sufficient information to undertake Stage 1 Appropriate Assessment Screening and accepted its conclusion that Appropriate Assessment was not required.
- 9.5 Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, and its location in a suburban area, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site
- 9.6 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The relatively small scale nature of the works proposed

- The lack thereof of any hydrological connection from the proposed development to the Natura 2000 site.
- Having regard to the screening report/determination carried out by the Planning Authority

9.7 I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

9.8 Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required

10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1. The proposed development is located approximately 2.0km to the west of Dublin Bay.

10.2 The proposed development consists of extensions to an existing residential unit

10.3 No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

10.4 I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

10.5 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The minor scope of the works and nature of the development
- The distance to the nearest water body, Dublin Bay and the lack of hydrological connections to the same.

10.6 I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes,

groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1 I recommend that permission for the development be granted

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

12.1 Having regard to the Objective 'A' zoning of the site, the relevant provisions of the Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown County Development Plan 2022–2028, and to the scale, design and siting of the proposed development, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions below, the development would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area

13.0 Conditions

1.	The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars. Reason: In the interest of clarity.
2.	The proposed development shall be amended as follows: (a) The window to the rear/southeast dormer shall be reduced to a maximum height of 0.75 metres, with a sill height of not less than 1.65 metres above finished floor level.

	(b) The windows serving the ensuite in the southwest-facing roof extension shall be fitted with manufactured opaque or frosted glazing and shall be permanently maintained as such. The application of film to clear glazing shall not be acceptable. Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Planning Authority prior to commencement of development. Reason: In the interest of residential amenity and privacy
3.	Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 07.00 to 18.00 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 08.00 to 14.00 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority. Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity
4	The site development works and construction works shall be carried out in such a manner as to ensure that the adjoining street(s) are kept clear of debris, soil and other material and, if the need arises for cleaning works to be carried out on the adjoining public roads, the said cleaning works shall be carried out at the developer's expense. Reason: To ensure that the adjoining roadways are kept in a clean and safe condition during construction works in the interests of orderly development
5.	Surface water drainage arrangements shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such services and works. Reason: In the interest of public health.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.

Andrew Hersey
Planning Inspector

4th September 2026

Appendix A: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL501540-DR-26
Proposed Development Summary	Residential Extensions
Development Address	1 Silchester Downs, Glenageary, Co. Dublin, A96 C3V6
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX /OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	☐ No, No further action required.
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u>, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
☒ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 2</u>, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	

☒ No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	State the Class and state the relevant threshold

Inspector: _____

Date: _____